

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 9, and 17 remain in the application and claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 17 have been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, and 17 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al.

Features of the network system according to the present invention are to form in a server (22 in Fig. 11) a group of users by producing a group ID (D122 in Fig. 11) in response to a group forming request (D121 in Fig. 11) transmitted by a terminal (13 in Fig. 11), to record another terminal (31 in Fig. 11) into the group in response to receiving the group ID (D132 in Fig. 11) from the other terminal (31 in Fig. 11), and to enable communications among members of the group. See Figs. 11 and 12 and page 28, line 21 to page 31, line 7 of the present application.

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 17 have been amended to emphasize these features of the present invention.

It is respectfully submitted that Lee et al. fails to show or suggest at least forming a group of users by producing a group ID in response to a group forming request transmitted by a terminal, and recording another terminal into the group in response to receiving the group ID from the other terminal. Lee et al. is merely teaching dividing a large database server (210

in Fig. 3) into a plurality of more manageable smaller databases (302-308 in Fig. 3). These smaller databases may be formed by grouping users in alphabetical order (e.g. A-F, G-S, T-Z) or beginning with specific numbers (e.g. 1-2, 3-6, 7-0). See col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line 11 of Lee et al., for example.

The groups of Lee et al. are merely formed for the purpose of quick access to the stored data of all the users in a large database. Therefore, there is no showing of suggestion in Lee et al. of forming a group of users by producing a group ID in response to a group forming request transmitted by a terminal, and recording another terminal into the group in response to receiving the group ID from the other terminal and, because there are no features in Floden et al. that somehow could be combined with Lee et al. and result in the presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 17, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 4, 6, and 9 under 35 USC 103(a), as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and further in view of Boyle et al.


The rejection of amended independent claims 4 and 9 over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. has been addressed above and, because there are no features in Boyle et al. that somehow could be combined with Lee et al. and Floden et al. and result in the

presently claimed invention, it is respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 4 and 9, and the claims depending therefrom, are patentably distinct over Lee et al. in view of Floden et al. and further in view of Boyle et al.

Entry of this amendment is earnestly solicited, and it is respectfully submitted that the amendments made to the claims hereby raise no new issues requiring further consideration and/or search, because all of the features of this invention have clearly been considered by the examiner in the prosecution of this application and because the present amendments serve only to further define and emphasize the novel features of this invention.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
COOPER & DUNHAM LLP


Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/PCF:tb